NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO

INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

IN RE:)
)
RESTORATION ADVISORY)
BOARD MEETING)
_____)

Transcript of Proceedings of the Naval Station

San Diego Installation Restoration Program

Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

National City, National City

Wednesday, May 26, 2004

Reported by:
Brooke Silvas
CSR No. 10988
JOB No. 622067

NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO

INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

IN RE:)
)
RESTORATION ADVISORY)
BOARD MEETING)
_____)

Transcript of Proceedings of the Naval Station, San Diego Installation Restoration Program, Restoration Advisory Board Meeting, at 801 National City Boulevard, U.S.S. Ranger Room, National City, California, commencing at 5:49 p.m., Wednesday, May 26, 2004, before Brooke Silvas, Certified Shorthad Reporter, No. 10988.

A T T E N D A N C E

NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST:	Ms. Theresa Morley
SOUTHWEST DIVISION NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND:	Mr. Mike Corry
DTSC:	Ms. Leticia Hernandez
BECHTEL NATIONAL:	Mr. Tim Heironimus Mr. Pete Stang
TAN PHUNG & ASSOCIATES:	Mr. Tan Phung Mr. William Lippincott, Ph.D.
ASSET GROUP, Inc:	Ms. Jeanna Sellmeyer Ms. Jennifer Schlax
PUBLIC ATTENDANCE:	Ms. Jeanette Hartman Ms. Brooke Silvas
RAB MEMBERS:	Ms. Rita McIntyre Mr. Craig Woempner Mr. Gene Mullaly Mr. Jerry McNutt Mr. Peter Bishop

NATIONAL CITY, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 2004

5:49 P.M.

17:49:01

17:49:07 THERESA MORLEY: Welcome, everybody. Welcome to our
17:49:10 RAB meeting. You all know me, of course. Do you know
17:49:13 Mike Corry?
17:49:17 MIKE CORRY: You met me a very long time ago.
17:49:21 THERESA MORLEY: He was much younger then.
17:49:24 And what projects are you working on?
17:49:38 MIKE CORRY: Site 10, Site 13. Site 10.
17:49:52 THERESA MORLEY: You know Leticia. You remember
17:49:58 Pete and Tim. And now we have in the corner your new
17:50:04 RAB contractor. Go Navy. So we went through the
17:50:09 bidding process. And the Navy's goal is to award small
17:50:14 business -- to small business 40 percent.
17:50:17 Tan Phung, you used to work for CKY. And now
17:50:20 you work for TPA, which is your own company. Right?
17:50:25 TAN PHUNG: Yes.
17:50:26 THERESA MORLEY: We have had much success from CKY.
17:50:30 That's in the blue suit. They have done a lot of work
17:50:33 for us. Not just IR work, but erosion control,
17:50:38 hydroseeding contracts, construction of our --
17:50:53 Basically Mike is here as the contracts person
17:51:11 who actually pays the invoices and stuff. But you just

tell us what you want him to do. Not Mike. Tim. So whatever documents you want reviewed, if you want written reports, whatever.

Did you have a question? You looked like you wanted to say something. I don't know if you want to look at it. After today, we should probably stay after a little bit and look at them.

We have to talk because afterwards you'll have a better idea of where we are. And you might want to think about what site you want. There you have it. We only have the 25,000. I don't know if you want to prioritize sites or just go until the money runs out. Whatever.

JERRY McNUTT: Does that have to be done by this fiscal year?

MIKE CORRY: The contract is for two years. The contract is a two-year period, but I need to check the specifics. I thought at one point when it was originally discussed, it was for one solid year. The 25,000 covered one solid year, but the contract was written for two years, which gives us a little bit of leeway. Now I think we're on the every-four-month plan with meetings.

Is that correct?

THERESA MORLEY: Uh-huh. Correct. That gives us

more leeway because it's written for RAB meetings. So we have to push another year.

MIKE CORRY: Teresa stole my thunder. If we're going into --

THERESA MORLEY: I'm still in introductions.

MIKE CORRY: Continue.

THERESA MORLEY: You know yourselves. And this is Asset Group, our new contractor that took over for Desktop Solutions Publishing. So they're all the contractor that takes the transcripts and stuff like that. So you guys can introduce yourself if you want.

JEANNA SELLMEYER: I'm Jeanna Sellmeyer. I'm the CEO of Asset Group.

JENNIFER SCHLAX: I'm Jennifer Schlax. I'm a contractor there.

BROOKE SILVAS: I'm Brooke Silvas. And I'm a court reporter.

THERESA MORLEY: She's from Oklahoma.

JEANNA SELLMEYER: I'm a Cowboy fan really at OSU. And I like the Sooners and a few of their sports.

THERESA MORLEY: Then you can introduce everyone else. How is that? Wait. Wait. One more thing before you go on. This is for you. The Navy is having their annual RAB. It's in Salt Lake City, Utah. It's usually the community co-chair and Navy co-chair who are

17:54:17 1 invited. I don't know if I can make it. If you weren't
17:54:19 2 able to go or you couldn't go, you could designate
17:54:24 3 someone else in your place.
17:54:26 4 PETER BISHOP: What day of the week?
17:54:28 5 THERESA MORLEY: The 13th through the 25th of
17:54:32 6 July.
17:54:33 7 PETER BISHOP: I'm teaching, so I can't go.
17:54:34 8 THERESA MORLEY: If you wanted to talk amongst
17:54:36 9 yourselves. I believe -- I have to look on the thing,
17:54:38 10 but I'm pretty sure that the Navy pays your travel. So
17:54:42 11 the Navy would pay for your flight and your hotel room.
17:54:45 12 I think. I'm pretty sure. And it's -- I'm not sure
17:54:50 13 what it is. Monday through Thursday.
17:54:55 14 PETER BISHOP: I would love to go, but they're not
17:54:57 15 going to let me out of school.
17:55:00 16 THERESA MORLEY: It's July. You're not in school in
17:55:02 17 July.
17:55:04 18 PETER BISHOP: Summer school. Some of us work all
17:55:07 19 year.
17:55:07 20 THERESA MORLEY: Is it Friday, Saturday and Sunday?
17:55:10 21 They must have done it on purpose so you could go.
17:55:19 22 PETER BISHOP: I may be able to do that.
17:55:19 23 THERESA MORLEY: And then if you did decide to go,
17:55:21 24 Pete, maybe you guys can talk about what you want to
17:55:24 25 bring up there or any questions that you want to ask.

17:55:26 1 And I can give you more information if you want.
17:55:30 2 Now, Mike, you can talk.
17:55:32 3 MIKE CORRY: I guess the table is mine. The TAPP
17:55:38 4 update. We've awarded a contract to an 8(a) company
17:55:43 5 called TPA. And they were just introduced. Tan and
17:55:48 6 Bill will be the representatives there. We sent out the
17:55:56 7 contract with the scope of the work and everything
17:55:58 8 involved. And the contract specifically says
17:56:02 9 independent and unbiased third parties. So I thought
17:56:05 10 the best way to do that is to throw them at you and
17:56:10 11 basically kind of let the Navy stand back a little bit.
17:56:16 12 And they're your tool. So if you do have anything in
17:56:20 13 mind to bounce off of them --
17:56:24 14 JERRY MCNUTT: Who was the contract awarded to?
17:56:29 15 MIKE CORRY: TPA.
17:56:33 16 JERRY MCNUTT: Why does this say something else?
17:56:36 17 MIKE CORRY: It shouldn't.
17:56:38 18 JERRY MCNUTT: It talks about the contract being
17:56:39 19 offered. Somebody out of San Pedro.
17:56:45 20 MIKE CORRY: Yeah. It's Tan Phung & Associates.
17:56:51 21 Sorry about that. TPA.
17:56:56 22 THERESA MORLEY: You'll get kicked out of the Navy
17:56:58 23 if you spell things right.
17:57:00 24 MIKE CORRY: I've already been working with you too
17:57:03 25 long. Tan Phung & Associates is the contractor. And

17:57:12 1 basically my job is to introduce them, which has already
17:57:15 2 been done, and see if you have any questions about the
17:57:18 3 contract or the contractor.
17:57:24 4 GENE MULLALY: There's a limited amount of budget
17:57:27 5 that we have.
17:57:28 6 MIKE CORRY: There is.
17:57:29 7 GENE MULLALY: It covers, what, a two-year period?
17:57:32 8 MIKE CORRY: Yes. And the way it basically works
17:57:35 9 out is in that -- during that time period, you're going
17:57:39 10 to have regulators comments and the Navy's comments.
17:57:42 11 And basically just about any form of correspondence that
17:57:46 12 -- at any time if you guys decide it might be worth
17:57:50 13 bouncing off the contractors here, then we have I
17:57:55 14 believe it's five -- up to five projects.
17:58:04 15 JERRY MCNUTT: That's non-RAB agents; right?
17:58:07 16 MIKE CORRY: Oh, no. Five non-RAB meetings.
17:58:11 17 There's four RAB meetings that they can attend. But I
17:58:11 18 believe it's five project events that occur during those
17:58:17 19 four RAB meetings. So --
17:58:24 20 WILLIAM LIPPINCOTT: It would be helpful if we got a
17:58:27 21 list of RAB so we knew who the audience is. It is
17:58:32 22 helpful to know -- in a lot of ways to review something.
17:58:37 23 It depends whether it's a synopsis or a validation,
17:58:42 24 whatever it might be. It helps steer what we do if we
17:58:47 25 understand who the audience is.

17:58:51 1 MIKE CORRY: That won't be a problem at all.
17:58:53 2 THERESA MORLEY: We also have our Website, remember,
17:58:54 3 that has all the RAB members on it and your photos and
17:58:59 4 bios.
17:59:02 5 JERRY MCNUTT: Is that Fusion something?
17:59:03 6 THERESA MORLEY: Frontfusion.
17:59:05 7 WILLIAM LIPPINCOTT: It looks like it's people on
17:59:08 8 this side of the table.
17:59:11 9 THERESA MORLEY: There are six RAB members. And
17:59:14 10 these are the six die-hards that have been hanging with
17:59:18 11 us for nine years. As Craig said, they have life
17:59:21 12 sentences.

17:59:23 13 PETER BISHOP: We can't get away from the meetings.
17:59:28 14 MIKE CORRY: That won't be a problem at all. That's
17:59:41 15 all I had.
17:59:42 16 THERESA MORLEY: And, again, basically we're going
17:59:44 17 over some of the sites today. But what we have is
17:59:47 18 coming up, site 1 might be a good one because we'll be
17:59:52 19 doing -- we're doing a tech memo to incorporate the
17:59:56 20 field work that we've done to date and then another RI
18:00:00 21 work plan. Because there's still some question whether
18:00:03 22 the quay wall is -- there's ground water going through
18:00:07 23 the quay wall, whether it's coming under the quay wall
18:00:08 24 through the sediment back into the bay, and how we're
18:00:11 25 going to find out that information and some more soil

work. So that might be a good one.

Site 2 is of course a very large site, the subsites. The RI report is coming out. And that report will have recommendations and conclusions. That might be a good one too because it's so big.

Site 3, we're going back into the field. The -- that -- in the future. The work plan is already final. And they're going to be doing the field work for that. But the report, again, will have conclusions and recommendations. And, you know, are we going to keep it the north area and south area? Or what -- how are we going to do the rest of the assessment?

Site 4, I don't know if -- that might be a lower priority just because I think you remember last time -- and you'll get an update on that tonight -- but there really wasn't that much in the soil. There were a couple areas that had hits. There were PAHs around it. But they're around everywhere. That's the one where there's a TCE plume coming on to the site. But it's not from site 4. We don't know that. We have to find where it's coming from. We're recommending no further action for that site. That would probably be a lower priority.

Site 10, we're doing an RI work plan, which you'll have the opportunity to read that work plan. They go back out and chase down some of the metals in

18:01:39 1 the ground water. And then when the field work is done,
18:01:46 2 you'll get that report. So I will, again, have
18:01:48 3 recommendations.
18:01:49 4 And I guess really those are -- site 13, we're
18:01:51 5 recommending unrestricted residential. So I don't know
18:01:55 6 if -- you could look at it and then decide if you had
18:01:59 7 comments or questions or you didn't agree with the Navy
18:02:03 8 or something.
18:02:04 9 But also I know that you guys -- kind of what
18:02:06 10 started this was site 7. And that -- I'll talk about
18:02:10 11 that later. The record of decision is going forward
18:02:13 12 with -- we did the extra ground water cleanup and did a
18:02:17 13 reproposed plan. So we're now going forward with the
18:02:23 14 record of decision for no further action.
18:02:26 15 Okay. Go ahead, Pete.
18:02:31 16 PETER BISHOP: I read the letter. And I --
18:02:36 17 THERESA MORLEY: Oh, the meeting minutes?
18:02:39 18 PETER BISHOP: Yeah. And I had some -- as I was
18:02:41 19 just reading, I had thoughts pop into my head. And I
18:02:44 20 just happened to have a red pen in my pocket.
18:02:48 21 THERESA MORLEY: You're such a teacher.
18:02:50 22 PETER BISHOP: I jotted down some questions. And
18:02:52 23 I'm sure some of these are probably scheduled to be
18:02:54 24 answered in the course of tonight's events. But why
18:02:57 25 don't I just run through them and see.

18:03:02 1 Okay. We had a presentation on the joint
18:03:08 2 Senate letter and the Navy's response. And the last
18:03:11 3 sentence here says, "The Navy doesn't think the clean-up
18:03:14 4 of contaminated sediment should occur until the sources
18:03:19 5 are eliminated." Which I think is a wonderful idea. I
18:03:19 6 support it. But the question is what are the sources?
18:03:23 7 Have we identified the sources?
18:03:26 8 THERESA MORLEY: Yeah. And that is kind of where we
18:03:29 9 are right now. That was why we wanted to stay under the
18:03:33 10 TMDL program, because in our opinion, you know -- you
18:03:39 11 know the Paleta Creek and the urban watersheds that
18:03:42 12 contribute to that. You know, we're at the tail end of
18:03:44 13 that watershed. And there are so many possible upstream
18:03:48 14 sources that to single out an RI site and say, you know,
18:03:51 15 we think this much came from it is impossible.
18:03:53 16 PETER BISHOP: Who is responsible to identify the
18:03:55 17 sources?
18:03:57 18 THERESA MORLEY: Technically, the State. So that's
18:04:00 19 why under the water board -- you know, they put that out
18:04:03 20 to the water boards, under the TMDL program, the total
18:04:08 21 maximum daily load program. And then the State came
18:04:10 22 back and said, "Navy, you're probably a PRP. NASCO,
18:04:14 23 you're probably a PRP. City, you definitely have PRPs
18:04:18 24 in your boundary. You guys need to come back and tell
18:04:21 25 us what those are." And that was the program that we

were working with the water board under.

And then DTSC came and said, "No, you have to do a separate recommendation under the CERCLA for the RI sites." And we said, "That's not really an efficient use of resources. We're already doing that for most of the sites under the TMDL program. Just let us continue with the City and the other people and the water board, trying to find these sources and let the program play out without having a separate program under CERCLA."

And that was kind of where the whole problem started. So we're all responsible for finding it. And that's what we've been working on right now.

PETER BISHOP: Okay. Has someone been tasked with this? Is there an agency that is taking the lead?

THERESA MORLEY: The State has been tasked by EPA.

PETER BISHOP: They're taking the lead?

THERESA MORLEY: Right. And then they kind of pass it on to the water boards. And then they -- depending on what your TM deal is. For example, diazinon and chosacrete is probably the TMDL that's in the lead right now. And that was primarily put upon the City because they looked around and said, "Well, who uses diazinon as a pesticide?" Not really the Navy. Not really Nasco. So the City had to do their study. And they're working on that right now. And they're farthest along. And I

18:05:36 1 think they've been given a time frame. Like they have
18:05:39 2 to have their TMDL in place by, like, December of '04.
18:05:43 3 They have to reduce it by 50 percent by 2007. And it
18:05:49 4 has to be almost completely gone by 2014.
18:05:54 5 PETER BISHOP: Do we have to wait until 2014?
18:05:57 6 THERESA MORLEY: I would be surprised if it happened
18:05:59 7 by then. Because diazanon is relatively easy due to the
18:06:04 8 fact that they banned it. And so that of course -- you
18:06:06 9 know, as people stop using it, it's going to stop coming
18:06:09 10 into the environment. But you look at Chollas Creek and
18:06:09 11 Paleta Creek, they were listed for metals, sediment
18:06:13 12 quality and toxicity, which -- yeah, that means
18:06:17 13 anything. Mercury, chlorinates, PCBs, you know, all
18:06:23 14 that kind of stuff. So trying to identify the sources
18:06:26 15 is going to take a long time. But stopping the sources
18:06:30 16 is going to be a really long time.
18:06:33 17 PETER BISHOP: Historical sources you're not going
18:06:35 18 to do anything about because the company is gone.
18:06:44 19 THERESA MORLEY: Right. And in that case, it will
18:06:44 20 be the Navy who has to clean it up because it ended up
18:06:44 21 in our section of the creek. Because where it comes
18:06:46 22 down, most of the creeks are channelized so that it --
18:06:49 23 the sediments have a tendency to get washed through.
18:06:54 24 And then the contamination has a tendency to stick to
18:06:58 25 the fine-grain sediment, which ends up being deposited

at the mouth of the creeks, which is on Navy property.

So -- but right now, they have -- Spaywar (phon.) is doing work for the Navy part of it. The City actually hasn't been able to fund that much. And so the Navy has funded the majority in another program on the compliance side of the house. And they have a draft report that's in at the water board. And I'm not sure if that's open for public review yet, but eventually I'm sure it will be if you're interested.

PETER BISHOP: Maybe next round it would be nice.

THERESA MORLEY: If we had a presentation on that? Okay.

PETER BISHOP: Where we're going on that. Because I think that's definitely a community issue.

RITA MCINTYRE: Those two creeks, though, have been a problem for a long time.

THERESA MORLEY: Yeah. A very long time.

RITA MCINTYRE: Did you know that, Pete?

PETER BISHOP: Huh?

RITA MCINTYRE: Those two creeks have been a problem for a long time and have been -- I mean a problem with us trying to look back at the sources of the polluters for those creeks that run -- end up into the Navy. And I mean, to me, having been a member here, it seems like, you know, now as things have progressed on the Navy's

18:08:17 1 property, that other sources need to be identified and,
18:08:20 2 you know, have them stop polluting.
18:08:24 3 THERESA MORLEY: And that was another reason why we
18:08:26 4 really didn't want to go into CERCLA is because how do
18:08:29 5 you determine -- if you look at the contamination that's
18:08:31 6 on the surface sites, primarily site 3 -- lead, PCBs,
18:08:36 7 PAHs -- and then you look at every storm water event and
18:08:39 8 you look at what comes down in the sediment, you know,
18:08:41 9 lead, mercury, PCB. If that creek has been dumping like
18:08:47 10 that for 50-something years and that site has been
18:08:50 11 there, it's like how can you get a sample from the creek
18:08:53 12 and go, "That's a Navy PCB." You know? It doesn't
18:08:55 13 leave a mark. I mean, there's no way to tell,
18:08:58 14 especially lead. Some things you can do forensic
18:09:03 15 pathologies, like some types of chemicals, but not most
18:09:04 16 of them. And we didn't want to say, you know, okay, if
18:09:07 17 we take samples in the creek under the IR program, that
18:09:09 18 now tied it to my IR site and we're responsible for
18:09:12 19 cleaning up that based on the IR site when with every
18:09:17 20 storm water event, there's new stuff coming down the
18:09:19 21 creek. And that controversy still hasn't played out.
18:09:23 22 We're still -- that still is our position. But the
18:09:25 23 regulators haven't agreed with us.
18:09:28 24 JERRY MCNUTT: So there's no response to these two
18:09:30 25 letters?

18:09:31 1 THERESA MORLEY: No. We're supposed to be planning
18:09:32 2 a meeting. And we think that we're going to get some
18:09:36 3 kind of resolution where they're going to say for sites
18:09:39 4 2 and 3, which are directly on the creek and in that
18:09:43 5 TMDL, okay, we'll let you go into the program. But for
18:09:49 6 site 1, which is in the bay, or Site 4, which is a
18:09:51 7 little bit upstream, we would like you to at least take
18:09:54 8 upstream and downstream sediment samples. And if
18:09:56 9 they're similar, then that proves your point that it's
18:09:58 10 not coming from the site.
18:10:00 11 The only problem is, again, once you get out of --
18:10:03 12 like site 1, you're not in the creek anymore. You're in
18:10:07 13 the bay. And site 4, it's going to be hard to find an
18:10:10 14 upstream site that has fine-grain sediment deposition,
18:10:14 15 which is what you need to do.
18:10:17 16 If you sample in gravel, they're not going to be the
18:10:20 17 same.
18:10:24 18 PETER BISHOP: Fine. But not the same
18:10:25 19 concentrations.
18:10:26 20 THERESA MORLEY: They seem to sweep through, though.
18:10:29 21 When the storm water comes down, the gravel kind of
18:10:31 22 tumbles down and they stick to the real fine-grain
18:10:36 23 stuff.
18:10:37 24 PETER BISHOP: Okay. We'll talk about that at the
18:10:39 25 next meeting, I guess.

18:10:41 1 THERESA MORLEY: Okay.
18:10:41 2 PETER BISHOP: Okay. My next question was I was
18:10:43 3 looking at the FY '04 budget. And we have moneys
18:10:48 4 distributed to various sites as laid down here. The
18:10:52 5 question is, is it possible, is it feasible, is it a
18:10:59 6 good idea to redirect money so we can close out some of
18:11:03 7 the things? Taking the money from A and putting it to B
18:11:07 8 to get B done, would that be a good idea?
18:11:12 9 THERESA MORLEY: You know, it is. And we're leaning
18:11:14 10 towards that.
18:11:16 11 JERRY MCNUTT: There's site 7 in the budget here.
18:11:18 12 Why don't you close it?
18:11:19 13 THERESA MORLEY: Right. And -- but see, now, that
18:11:20 14 one, the record of decision is going forward finally on
18:11:24 15 7, 11 -- 5, 7, 11, 12. Site 5 is done. We finished
18:11:29 16 that clean-up. 13 is close to being done and it's
18:11:32 17 funded. So IR site 8, the fire fighting school, got
18:11:36 18 closed. I don't know if you heard that at the last RAB
18:11:37 19 meeting. We did receive the closure on that. So that
18:11:41 20 was a good one. So we're really left with the big ones,
18:11:51 21 1, 2, 3, 4 and 10.
18:11:51 22 PETER BISHOP: Okay. Just a thought.
18:11:51 23 Let's see. IR site 3. Storyboard. It says
18:11:58 24 the work plan should be issued for first quarter, 2004.
18:12:00 25 However, there is a sediment issue that is currently

18:12:04 1 outstanding. Which sediment issue?
18:12:08 2 THERESA MORLEY: The one I just discussed.
18:12:09 3 PETER BISHOP: Oh.
18:12:09 4 THERESA MORLEY: They -- again, they want us to take
18:12:11 5 samples as part of the site 3 work. And we're saying
18:12:15 6 no. And they did finally agree to that.
18:12:18 7 PETER BISHOP: Okay. IR 7, first paragraph, there
18:12:24 8 are outstanding questions. And the Navy does feel
18:12:34 9 confident they will be able to satisfy those questions
18:12:37 10 in the coming year? And the site is currently used as a
18:12:40 11 parking lot.
18:12:40 12 My note is -- the question is which one?
18:12:44 13 THERESA MORLEY: Which parking lot?
18:12:46 14 PETER BISHOP: Oh, current information. They agree
18:12:48 15 with the Navy, and the site is to be closed. Will 7 be
18:12:53 16 closed? There are outstanding questions, so it can't be
18:12:56 17 closed. I'm getting conflicting feelings on that.
18:13:00 18 THERESA MORLEY: Yeah. I don't know about
18:13:01 19 questions. It's more that they want to see -- see, the
18:13:09 20 way that the process happens, you do the proposed plan.
18:13:12 21 And that goes out for public comment. And that's where
18:13:16 22 we got stuck with the ground water issue. So instead of
18:13:20 23 going back and redoing the proposed plan to say that we
18:13:23 24 did a year of ground water sampling, that will have to
18:13:27 25 go into the ROD. So he's basically saying if someone

has a question, he wants to make sure that the ROD goes back and addresses things that have changed since the proposed change plan. To the best of my understanding.

PETER BISHOP: Well, at that point, my pen ran out of ink.

THERESA MORLEY: Okay. Would you like to introduce our next speaker then?

PETER BISHOP: Yes. Who is speaking next? Corry spoke. Pete Stang.

PETE STANG: Thank you, Pete.

PETER BISHOP: You're welcome, Pete.

PETE STANG: Can you queue me up?

JEANNA SELLMEYER: I can.

THERESA MORLEY: Do you want the lights off?

PETE STANG: I think we're okay.

We'll start with site 10 on the schedule. The second one down.

Thank you.

Site 10 at Naval Station, just a brief update of where we are and where we're going here in the short term. The Navy and Agency partners agreed last year that Site 10 was not adequately characterized for PAHs, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, and metals in soil or volatile organic carbon compounds in ground water.

We have currently a work plan that will be

delivered to the Navy for their review internally next week that will propose soil and ground water sample locations to complete delineation. Upon Navy review of that within a month or two, it will be turned around and provided to the Agency and the RAB for their review and comment.

The locations that we're going to place those soil and ground water samples will be determined based on soil. And it will be a very specific and targeted approach. And just this past month, the Navy PWC group used their innovative technology, the membrane-interface probe with their SCAPs unit to assess the current VOC distribution in ground water.

Site 10 is roughly in the middle of Naval Station some 7- or 800 feet from San Diego Bay. It's currently as -- for practical purposes, most of the current large IR site, it's primarily a paved parking lot. It has one small building remaining on it, a racquetball court. So right now, there are no current exposure pathways to human health. It's a completely paved site. So it's not an open or an uncontrolled hazardous waste site.

The outline of Site 10. Again, you can see primarily a paved parking lot. Small racquetball court in the north -- northwest corner. And the footprint of

18:17:29 1 the former building 321, which was at least one of the
18:17:34 2 possible sources of contamination.
18:17:38 3 Ground water flow is generally toward the --
18:17:42 4 the west and west southwest. And right in here is
18:17:52 5 probably the worst area of contamination. And the two
18:17:56 6 wells of largest concern are roughly right in this
18:18:00 7 location. Because this well that was pretty much on the
18:18:05 8 down-gradient end did have chlorinated solvents, the
18:18:09 9 highest levels on the site, the Navy and Agency agreed
18:18:12 10 that this down-gradient area in the direction of ground
18:18:16 11 water flow was inadequately characterized. And that's
18:18:24 12 one of the focus points for the next investigation.
18:18:26 13 The waste stream sources on this site were a
18:18:32 14 metal finishing and preservation activity building, that
18:18:34 15 former building 321. Used solvents, probably did have
18:18:41 16 some metal applications as well. The site was
18:18:46 17 originally almost intertidal on San Diego Bay before the
18:18:54 18 Navy brought in seven or eight feet of fill to create
18:18:59 19 the current condition of Naval Station's current
18:19:03 20 elevation. And the low lying area does have a limited
18:19:06 21 amount of debris that was probably filled in. I
18:19:08 22 wouldn't characterize it -- characterize it as a dump or
18:19:14 23 a landfill, more along the lines of some broken
18:19:16 24 porcelain, probably a couple mattress box springs. It's
18:19:22 25 a small but identified area of construction debris and

hydrocarbon staining from this 1989 geotechnical investigation that started the -- the site on its way as an IR site.

Also, Cosmoline, a heavy-end petroleum, almost similar to let's say Vaseline, may have been used. It's not confirmed. But it may have been used to treat equipment going out to sea or coming back from sea as a rust inhibitor on Jeeps, trailers, equipment that would be on deployed vessels.

The objectives: Address the Agency comments. Primarily the issues were with respect to delineation of those VOCs, particularly cholorobenzene and dichlorobenzene in ground water, a couple metals, lead and arsenic in soil, and one PAH in particular, benzanthracene. Based on getting more complete delineation, in other words, making sure that we have the extent, the breadth and depth of contamination actually pinned down better than it currently is.

Revise the human health risk assessment. The Navy would like to, if the site continues on and does need some sort of long-term institutional control associated with it, reduce the site boundaries. The northern boundary does not appear from the amount of data that we have to be impacted at the same level as that southwest corner. And to make recommendations

18:21:08 1 based on the continued industrial use or possible future
18:21:14 2 residential scenario.
18:21:15 3 We have a moderate amount of data at the site.
18:21:19 4 140 soil samples. 30 ground water samples and 83 soil
18:21:24 5 gas samples. And a litany of where we've gone so far.
18:21:28 6 There are six wells on site. They have been sampled
18:21:32 7 four times each in 1999 and 2000.
18:21:40 8 Metals in soil. One of the issues at this site
18:21:46 9 are these lead values in blue, along with the arsenic.
18:21:52 10 The background for lead at Naval Station is roughly 100
18:21:57 11 parts per million. About 94. And we have two locations
18:22:03 12 that are over 10,000 ppm. 10,800 at 8 feet and 16,300
18:22:08 13 ppm at 9 feet. The interesting signature on this, along
18:22:17 14 with also the lead signature on this third pole is that
18:22:21 15 you don't see particularly high values in the shallow at
18:22:26 16 the one foot or two foot, but we see it at depth,
18:22:29 17 somewhere right near the surface of ground water. That
18:22:33 18 -- because the investigation went on through several
18:22:38 19 different interations, that's something there hasn't
18:22:40 20 been adequate characterization with depth.
18:22:43 21 In other words, we don't know what's happening
18:22:45 22 below the surface of ground water at roughly 8 to 9
18:22:49 23 feet. That lead signature may drop down to these much
18:22:52 24 more limited background values. But we don't know. We
18:22:56 25 have to go out there and demonstrate that to make sure

that we're doing a good job of protecting human health and the environment.

Arsenic in one location is quite similar. A very low surface signature above the one high arsenic value in the middle of the site. Substantially over Naval Station background. These values are within Naval Station background value of arsenic of approximately 9. So we have to, for metals in particular and soil, address the vertical extent.

VOCs in soil. A lot of data. There are some elevated -- elevated values of cholorobenzene and dichlorobenzene, which are these little boxes. I think it will become clearer when we get to ground water. We have at this one location a fairly high detection of dichlorobenzene and also cholorobenzene, low detection/moderate detection in a couple locations of the dichlorobenzene. And some acetone at the site as well.

SVOCs in soil. Benzanthracene -- hopefully it will come up. Here we go. In the middle of the site, which was the low lying area when this overall site was filled, has a series of PAH SOV contaminants that are primarily petroleum -- heavy in petroleum related. And in particular, the benzoleanthrocene is the risk driver from soil for those petroleum-related compounds.

These volatile organic compounds in ground water are probably the most problematic for the site, particularly the dichlorobenzene. Again, ground water was going from east roughly toward the west, in the direction of the laser pointer. And the cholorobenzene in this well and this well, which are the down-gradient wells, were on the order of a part per million. 1200 ppb. And this well, it was, again, 9- to 1200 ppb over several different monitoring events. And on the lower but still undelineated level of the dichlorobenzene. The Agency and Navy agreed that this down-gradient area was inadequately delineated. And we needed to find how far that dichlorobenzene went.

Just this past month, the Navy executed a limited scope of reconnaissance survey, screening-level survey, with the membrane-interface probe. It was used in nine locations to confirm the previous results for cholorobenzene and dichlorobenzene at wells 4 and 5. Screen for down and the side gradient presence of those chlorinated VOCs, particularly chlorobenzene, go deeper than our current wells, which terminate at about 20 feet below grade, to see if those chlorinated solvent values may be deeper than we currently know. So, again, similar to the metals. Hopefully vertical extent issue. And to determine the locations for the future wells for

18:26:49 1 our upcoming work. And assess the potential presence of
18:26:52 2 a lower confining unit. Again, look for some silt or
18:26:56 3 clay, some fine-grade material that would possibly
18:27:01 4 impede vertical migration of either of those chlorinated
18:27:04 5 metals, if necessary.
18:27:07 6 PETER BISHOP: Are you looking -- is this just down
18:27:10 7 to ground water or are you going to take samples below?
18:27:15 8 PETE STANG: No. The membrane-interface probe can
18:27:15 9 plug samples both in the betazone (phon.) and ground
18:27:17 10 water. And this survey went down at these nine
18:27:21 11 locations. In seven of the locations, down to some 40
18:27:26 12 feet or greater. So down to that first fine-grade unit.
18:27:33 13 Some good news on a site that maybe needs a
18:27:37 14 little good news. When we sampled and worked around
18:27:41 15 this well, put the probe actually in the well and
18:27:44 16 adjacent to it, we found values quite similar to what
18:27:49 17 were present three to four years ago. The screening
18:27:52 18 levels said it was about 8- to 900 ppb, very similar to

18:28:00 19 the 1.2 ppm. Maybe the good news is this down-gradient
18:28:02 20 well right here, MW-4, was significantly lower. The
18:28:07 21 screening method indicated it was on the order of 10 to
18:28:10 22 20 part per billion rather than the nearly 1,000 parts
18:28:15 23 per billion. So we may have a reducing or a contracting
18:28:20 24 plume.
18:28:20 25 Additionally, as we had scheduled to go out and

look down gradient and side-gradient, we were pleasantly surprised, we did not find anything off to the side or down gradient or up here in the up-gradient portion of the site. And from the standpoint for chlorinates in particular, where we had planned to have wells down here possibly off of the picture to the southwest, to the west southwest, our blue points here, we've been able to bring that proposed well gallery into a much tighter area and should be able to get better data density. Hopefully by having screened or pre-characterized the site, we're going to be able to go out there and put these wells in smarter locations.

The red dots are for soil. And each one of these red dots, there's about 18 proposed borings that we're planning on putting in. It actually has a pretty defined purpose. Each one of these is to go back in and confirm those elevated metal values, go down below those locations, move out to the side to show where there were some elevated metal concentrations. Then we have horizontal delineation on them. These five locations up here are trying to get some additional data to -- if we have to have some level of long-term issue in this area to be able to remove this part of the site from any further concern in that what we have done up here in the past is not indicated. This part of the site has

nowhere near the same level of impact down here. So our survey last month was able to give us some good information from the chlorinated samples.

Again those results, that 1 part per million, was confirmed at MW-5, but a significantly reduced concentration at MW-4. We didn't find those chlorinated benzenes, the chlorobenzene or dichlorobenzene, down or side-gradient from MW-4 or MW-5. Below about 25 feet, we encountered what we believe should be a fairly continuous layer of fine-grain material that would, in fact, retard vertical migration downward. We didn't find any of those chlorinates below 20 feet. And we should be able to install those wells more accurately.

Based on that, that work plan that the Navy will receive for internal review next week, based on the April survey -- in large part, the April survey should be able to help us address the comments that the Agency and Navy agreed needed to be addressed. And our current projected time line will be a draft work plan to Agency and RAB members in July. Hopefully September be able to address those -- take those comments in and address them. And by late this calendar year, finalize that work plan, get out there into the field and actually try and get this site delineated for those metals and chlorinated solvents and PAHs.

I would be happy to entertain any questions at this time.

RITA MCINTYRE: I noticed in the beginning you said that -- that it would be for industrial, which is the current use, or future residential. If you characterize the site now -- I mean, aren't those different, the levels and so on and so forth?

PETE STANG: That's correct. What we do in the RI is we can assess risks to human health several different ways. We can take the existing data, and we can say under current conditions as a parking lot or as an industrial facility or as a commericial-type land use, these are reasonably what the risks are because you would only be exposed to soil under this type of circumstance. And realistically, it's a parking lot. The soil exposure would be for essentially a utility worker or a PWC maintenance worker to be -- have to get into utilities, tear up the asphalt and get the exposure to soil.

We can also use that data to project if land use were to change and these chemical concentrations were to stay stable, static, what would a person digging in -- if they put a garden there or planted trees and were exposed to soil within the upper so many feet, we can project what a future -- the hypothetical resident

might be exposed to and calculate a risk value for that. The Navy would make their decisions on what appropriate land use would be based on knowing what the risk is under those different scenarios.

So did I answer your question?

RITA MCINTYRE: Yes. Thank you.

PETER BISHOP: Sounds like a plan.

THERESA MORLEY: Thanks, Pete.

PETE STANG: Thank you, Pete. Should I introduce myself for the next presentation as well?

PETER BISHOP: The next will be presented by Mr. Pete Stang on the updated IRP site 2.

PETE STANG: Thank you. I'm going to follow up with the status update on the Site 2 remedial investigation, preliminary findings and where we are currently at the Site 2. The purpose of the RI, which initiated in roughly October of 2003 and is ongoing with respect to continued ground water monitoring, was to complete the definition of the nature and extent of contamination in soil and ground water, conduct the human health risk assessment, evaluate the potential for ground water discharge to the bay and the quality of ground water at or immediately adjacent to the quay wall, and to collect data to support remedy evaluation and selection.

As Teresa mentioned earlier, site 2 is 23

acres. Just to remind everybody, the recent subsite 2A removal action in the western portion of the site, which is now this parking lot and the greenbelt grass buffer zone, to minimize sheet flow runoff toward the bay was completed in 2003. And some 83,000 cubic yards of soil and material were excavated from that site and hauled off to a landfill. So there has been significant improvement and progress made at Site 2 with this western portion being -- being the subject of a removal action.

The rest of the site, large parts are paved. Other parts are unpaved. And there are still some chemicals of concern present at the site. And our purpose was to characterize it sufficiently to be able to help -- help the Navy make decisions.

For ground water, our field scope was to use the eight existing wells. We installed 13 additional shallow wells. We installed four deep wells to assess deeper ground water below the first fine-grade unit to establish whether there were any sinkers or deep dense non-aqueous liquids that might be penetrating down deep vertical migration.

The third round of ground water sampling was just completed yesterday. Pardon me, today is Wednesday. Just completed Monday. We conducted a tidal

18:37:24 1 influence study over actually a 72-hour period to help
18:37:30 2 us determine what direction ground water is actually
18:37:33 3 moving. When ground water fluctuates in a particular
18:37:37 4 well, literally the time of day or state of tide can
18:37:41 5 significantly change what your apparent ground water
18:37:44 6 flow direction is. So -- so we wanted to use this tidal
18:37:46 7 influence study to help us determine what direction the
18:37:50 8 net gradient was at the site.
18:37:58 9 That tidal influence study for the shallow
18:38:01 10 wells basically indicated that ground water is primarily
18:38:06 11 moving north across Naval site 2 with some component of
18:38:14 12 flow along the quay wall in a direction from west toward
18:38:20 13 the east. And this may, in fact, be a somewhat
18:38:24 14 transient phenomena in that the quay wall here just
18:38:31 15 within -- Teresa, correct me if I'm wrong -- within the
18:38:36 16 past 12 to 15 months, there was a quay wall improvement
18:38:40 17 project that put in a new concrete quay wall right along
18:38:45 18 here. With that water generally moving west, but as you
18:38:49 19 get toward -- toward the quay wall moving -- pardon me,
18:38:55 20 general direction toward the north, near the quay wall,
18:38:59 21 a direction toward the east, at first, it gave us a
18:39:05 22 little bit of a surprise. But it actually makes sense.
18:39:08 23 If that quay wall is impermeable to ground water --
18:39:12 24 shallow ground water flow. We have fresh concrete
18:39:17 25 there. It's acting as a cofferdam. It's impeding

18:39:21 1 ground water flow toward the bay. And it's moving
18:39:23 2 toward the last portion of the unimproved quay wall
18:39:28 3 toward the head of Paleta Creek.
18:39:34 4 CRAIG WOEMPNER: What's the depth of the footing on
18:39:38 5 that?
18:39:39 6 PETE STANG: Pardon me?
18:39:39 7 CRAIG WOEMPNER: What's the depth of the footing on
18:39:39 8 that?
18:39:39 9 PETE STANG: That quay is to -- I believe -- I've
18:39:42 10 asked for the -- the old quay wall keyed to minus 28,
18:39:46 11 which would be roughly 40 feet below existing grade.
18:39:51 12 CRAIG WOEMPNER: Is that from sea level or grade?
18:39:54 13 PETE STANG: 40 feet below grade. 28 feet below sea
18:39:59 14 level. With a mud level out here somewhere around 16 to
18:40:03 15 18 feet below sea level. I believe the new quay wall is
18:40:08 16 some five to six feet deeper than that.
18:40:12 17 JEANNA SELLMEYER: You said that was the old one,
18:40:14 18 the 40-foot?
18:40:15 19 PETE STANG: Yes. Deeper ground water has an inward
18:40:25 20 factor. In other words, from this standpoint, we
18:40:30 21 interpret that ground water is some 30 to 40 feet,
18:40:33 22 pretty much close to the tip depth or the quay depth of
18:40:37 23 the quay wall. Water is vectored toward the interior of
18:40:45 24 the site underneath that quay wall. So, again, making
18:40:50 25 an argument that that quay wall may have some

significant component of stopping hydraulic flow of the shallow ground water.

This is admittedly an ugly figure. But what it is is -- the green, greatest variation in ground water elevation, is what the tide was doing in San Diego Bay the week before Christmas. It was the most extreme high and low tide from December 20th to about December 23rd. We did a tidal cycle study during that period of time. The wells immediately adjacent to the quay wall and the deep wells are the wells that exhibited very strong tidal influence. In other words, they are showing some level of significant hydraulic communication with San Diego Bay.

These lines through the middle that show, for all intents and purposes, no substantial adjustment of elevation over the most extreme tides of the year are the preponderance of shallow wells on the interior of the site or those that are set back more than some 50 feet away from San Diego Bay. So once you get more than 50 to 60 feet away from San Diego Bay, with one notable exception, ground water really isn't being influenced by the tides of San Diego Bay. And that's giving us a pretty good snapshot look of what -- what's going on hydraulically with ground water.

GENE MULLALY: What level is that?

18:42:48 1 PETE STANG: The shallow wells are the upper six to
18:42:52 2 nine feet of ground water. So that would be anywhere
18:42:54 3 from about eight feet below land surface down to maybe
18:43:00 4 19 to 20 feet below land surface. Those deeper wells,
18:43:04 5 the four wells in particular that were very efficient
18:43:08 6 pumpers, whether they were close to the bay or set back
18:43:11 7 from the bay, are on the order of about 40 feet below
18:43:15 8 grade. And there is, across the site, from about 22 to
18:43:24 9 about 28 feet when we did our CPT study, 83 of the 84
18:43:33 10 CPT holds show significant clay in every hole, which
18:43:41 11 acts as a -- as a retarding agent where dense
18:43:45 12 sinker-type contaminants probably wouldn't get through.
18:43:49 13 And that whole hydraulic signature that I put up there
18:43:53 14 pretty much supports that -- that argument as well. The
18:43:58 15 fourth one was full of silt, which is still very fine --
18:44:01 16 a very fine gradient unit. But that consistent amount
18:44:08 17 of ecologic information on a site this size is a pretty
18:44:12 18 good argument that that is a continuous feature across
18:44:17 19 the entire site.
18:44:19 20 From a standpoint of soil and -- and the site
18:44:22 21 as a whole, these are the locations of where the cone
18:44:26 22 penetrometer holes were. They're basically on a
18:44:30 23 100-by-100-foot grid. And we followed that up with both
18:44:34 24 prescriptive or very specific depth intervals for soil
18:44:39 25 samples along with targeted soil sample intervals based

on the cone penetrometer data. That was done on some of these sites. This is --

Actually, I'm not getting the animation out of this one. I apologize. I did on the other one.

What this does is it shows the ground water for Naval Station San Diego.

Can I -- can I actually get up and blow this -- expand the size of this in PowerPoint?

JEANNA SELLMEYER: I don't know how to do it that way, but I know I can do it this way.

PETE STANG: Great.

JEANNA SELLMEYER: How much?

PETE STANG: Keep going.

Out of these 26 monitoring wells out at the site for ground water anyway, we got some pleasant surprises. Two-thirds of the wells had no detectable VOCs in them as all. And roughly 55 -- over half of the wells had no detectable VOCs or -- and SVOCs in them.

PETER BISHOP: Is there an area associated with that?

PETE STANG: The perimeter -- the southern area here is actually very limited. No VOCs or SVOCs up in here. Also up in here was pretty clean. The two locations of significance are -- when you see these blue values up in here, these are the monitoring wells immediately

adjacent to and within subsite 2G, which was the former wharf builders yard. And there was, in the 1996-1997 time frame, a limited removal to try and get out the worst of some of the -- the heavy and petroleum impact in this location. It was, I'll say, somewhat effective. It got out of the worst of it. But there's still a payload effect of some residual contamination around here that -- that may -- in fact, within -- when we go down the road may be part of a -- a feasibility study.

Right now, we have concentrations of VOCs and SVOCs in excess of our screening criteria. In other words, if that water discharged directly to San Diego Bay, it -- it would be above threshold values.

PETER BISHOP: If the ground water flow is up to the northeast, which shows no contamination --

PETE STANG: That's true.

PETER BISHOP: -- it doesn't look like that's very mobile.

PETE STANG: It probably isn't very mobile. What I -- what I would say is because this quay wall has been installed fairly recently and the ground water flow is that way, within the past year, I wouldn't expect under these conditions to get an extreme amount of advective flow. In other words, contamination that might be here, since that quay wall was installed, may only get to here

18:48:18 1 and wouldn't be to these two -- actually three wells,
18:48:22 2 two here and one here, that would intercept it down that
18:48:25 3 flow path yet.
18:48:27 4 PETER BISHOP: All right.
18:48:29 5 PETE STANG: The other issue right on the corner of
18:48:32 6 the two-way removal action, we did have some detectable
18:48:36 7 values of VOCs and SVOCs right down here. But they
18:48:41 8 weren't in excess of our screening criteria. Based on
18:48:49 9 that information, just this past week, last weekend and
18:48:49 10 as late as this past Saturday, we put four additional
18:48:52 11 wells in to try -- right about here, to try and see
18:48:58 12 what's going on maybe in a little bit more detail from
18:49:01 13 what we see in these two locations and two down here.
18:49:09 14 Shallow and deeper. And again, here, shallow and
18:49:13 15 deeper. They'll be sampled within the next week or two.
18:49:17 16 And they'll be brought in the fourth and final ground
18:49:21 17 water monitoring event roughly three months from now.
18:49:29 18 Can we squeeze that down again with your --
18:49:39 19 THERESA MORLEY: Is it the minus sign?
18:49:39 20 JEANNA SELLMEYER: Yeah.
18:49:39 21 THERESA MORLEY: All right.
18:49:31 22 PETE STANG: Teresa, we're a team.
18:49:41 23 Shallow ground water gradient is toward the
18:49:44 24 bay. The VOCs and SVOCs are present in ground water.
18:49:47 25 But many wells without any present. Concentrations

above screening criteria are generally clustered in those shallow wells near 2G.

The deeper ground water from 30 to 40 feet below grade is directed south and does not possess any VOCs or SVOCs above the criteria. By and large, it appears that fine-grade material has either impeded anything that might get down there -- although, we didn't really see any levels in those fairly significant number, 20 -- more than 20 shallow wells. We didn't see any chlorinates greater than about, I believe, about 7 -- 6 or 7 part per billion, which is certainly nothing suggested of a significant source for a sinker.

For soil, we surveyed the locations. Clear for utilities. Collected roughly 250 soil samples on a 100-by-100-foot grid across the majority of the site, except for Site 2A, which had been excavated. No real purpose in sampling clean soil that had just been brought there, had just put in there within the past year or two.

That grid represents roughly a little over 80 locations with roughly 250 soil samples collected.

There's a lot of data for soil. And I'm going to focus on this one, which is focusing on dioxins and furans in shallow soil in the central portion of the site here. And this is what will probably during the

18:51:51 1 risk assessment turn out to be the substantial risk
18:51:55 2 driver for a human health issue. The dioxins and furans
18:52:02 3 have very low criteria. In other words, they are both
18:52:05 4 persistent chemicals and toxic at fairly low
18:52:11 5 concentrations to -- to humans. These values -- as you
18:52:17 6 can see, there are maybe 10 or 20 different chemicals
18:52:22 7 listed. A lot of them are in the shallow, the
18:52:26 8 zero-to-two-and-a-half-foot range soil down essentially
18:52:30 9 immediately to the east of the former subsite 2A. And
18:52:43 10 they're pretty much clustered within this area. We're
18:52:47 11 still in the risk assessment process. But the
18:52:51 12 information we have now certainly suggests that while
18:52:55 13 there are other chemicals of certain, the primary risk
18:52:59 14 factor or risk driver coming out of the human health
18:53:03 15 risk assessment will probably be these dioxins and
18:53:05 16 furans in shallow soil that may be associated with the
18:53:13 17 former activities within 2A down here.
18:53:19 18 CRAIG WOEMPNER: I can't really read those. Can you
18:53:23 19 name off some of those?
18:53:25 20 PETE STANG: Teresa, do you want -- even when we
18:53:28 21 blow it up -- rather than try to --
18:53:28 22 CRAIG WOEMPNER: Can you give us some examples?
18:53:30 23 PETE STANG: Sure.
18:53:35 24 THERESA MORLEY: Can this move over to the right or
18:53:37 25 to the left?

18:53:40 1 JEANNA SELLMEYER: I am not sure about that.
18:53:52 2 PETE STANG: The Hepsa, the five, six and seven
18:53:59 3 chlorinated dioxins and furans are present.
18:54:05 4 CRAIG WOEMPNER: Most of those are the same then?
18:54:09 5 Most of those are the same stuff?
18:54:12 6 PETE STANG: Yeah. The same dioxins and furans. A
18:54:16 7 pretty broad spectrum of them. And the signature is
18:54:22 8 predominantly shallow.
18:54:23 9 If you can screen out a little. This is fine
18:54:27 10 where it is. Thanks.
18:54:28 11 Right up here, this column -- here are the --
18:54:31 12 if you could read them -- and obviously we can't --
18:54:34 13 these are the different chemicals right here. The
18:54:41 14 zero-to-two-foot range has the predominance of those
18:54:46 15 detected chemicals. The second column only has two of
18:54:53 16 the dioxins and furans detected at a deeper depth. In
18:54:59 17 this location, it was roughly eight to nine and a half
18:55:02 18 feet below grade. So I was -- I apologize. I wasn't
18:55:05 19 trying to necessarily bring up all the data. Just to
18:55:15 20 show a general pattern that --
18:55:15 21 CRAIG WOEMPNER: I was just curious.
18:55:15 22 PETE STANG: -- within the TG-2C general region of
18:55:20 23 subsites -- and they're predominantly -- here is another
18:55:23 24 location and here again where the vast majority of
18:55:27 25 detected dioxins and furans were found in the shallow

soil sample. And you get down eight or nine feet and much more limited here. Two or three instead of ten or twelve. Shallow maybe ten or fifteen. I believe that this location five to six feet. And then a single one from nine to ten feet below grade. Summary of the soil results, a hundred different chemicals or more were detected. The PAHs and dioxins and furans will be the dominant risk driver for receptors who could be exposed to the upper two feet of soil at the site, which would be an industrial- or commercial-type worker in the way both DTSE and ETA recommend human health risk assessment be conducted.

VOCs in soil and, as we mentioned earlier, in ground water do appear to be limited at the site. And deeper impacted soil at 2 to 10 feet below is present in Subsite 2G, again, that hallow effect around the perimeter of where the petroleum action occurred around 2G.

Our time line. The end of December, the soil and first round of ground water sampling was completed. February, the second round of ground water sampling was completed. Just here within the past couple of days, the third round of ground water sampling was completed and the installation of four monitoring wells was completed. Those will be brought into the network they

were developed following installation yesterday. And they will be sampled when we get full access out there, as we've been trying to work around a Navy road construction project. We are in currently the May/June time frame. Risk assessment and report preparation stage of our work.

I would be happy to entertain questions.

CRAIG WOEMPNER: Have the chlorophenols been found? Has there been anything like that found, the preservatives?

PETE STANG: There was some arsenic and creosote detected over in 2G, but I don't recall that any chlorophenols were detected. I don't know if the Navy used that at this site.

Teresa, Pete, if there are no other questions, I'll take a break.

PETER BISHOP: Does anybody have any questions?

Let's move right along then. Next, Mr. Heironimus.

TIM HEIRONIMUS: I think Pete is probably talked out by now, so I'll do this one, the update for Site 4.

I believe the last time we had a presentation on Site 4 was after we had completed the RI report and the results were out and we had it in the report and it was ready to go out for a review. I think that was

maybe around the fall of last year, something like that. I'm not sure exactly what RAB meeting it would have been. Karen Collins probably would have done the presentation. But -- so the purpose here is just to sort of not go back and rehash that too much, but hit the high points and talk about what -- what developments have taken place during that period of time and bring you up to the present here.

Which one advances?

Okay. For everyone here, here is a map of Naval Station. And you can see Site 4 located right here in the yellow. It's on the east side of Harbor Drive. And Site 4 was the former defense property disposal office. And now it's actually being used for the same purpose. But it's largely to take materials and recycle, resell what the Navy is able to do. It has had some history behind it. Before, it was used as a recycling disposal office site. It was a parking lot used for that activity. And then it also was used for some drum storage at different periods of time.

So -- here is just a photo of the -- looking north onto Site 4. For those of you who are familiar with it -- we might have done a site visit out to Site 4 -- this is the gate here. That's the north half of it or what we call the north half of it where it's paved,

and the recycling and resell of metal material and that kind of thing is taking place. So that's the view looking north.

And if we look to the south, this is a larger portion of the site. Most of this is unpaved or may be paved. It's kind of hard to tell. There's a gravel surface here. And there may be pavement underneath it. But it's kind of hit or miss right now. But a lot of it is being used for boat storage. You can see some of the boats located there now. But from time to time, that's been completely filled with barges and those kinds of things. So it's -- this is actually a period of time when it wasn't too cluttered up.

Just to touch on the conclusions for the remedial investigation. Volatile organic compounds, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, and metals were not reported in soil at concentrations that present unacceptable risks. And that's coined in terms of its present land use. In other words, for an industrial use, the risks were found to be generally acceptable.

The other significant thing is the PAHs, these polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, the heavy hydrocarbon compounds, those were found throughout the fill material on the site. If you recall, the site was constructed by placing about anywhere from eight to ten feet of fill

soil on top of the reclaimed land for its present use. So throughout all the fill material, PAHs were -- in darn near every sample. And the concentrations vary from low to high. No clear patterns for that.

What we're able to discern from all of that is there could be multiple sources of the PAHs. There was the waste oil application to keep dust down when it was a parking lot. There was equipment and cars being parked on it from time to time. There's also the hydraulic fill itself. Remember, it was actually pumped out of San Diego Bay and used to reclaim. So there could be have been PAHs in the fill when it was being placed on the site. And the other possibility is it's from aerial deposition or material that may -- wind has blown over from the railroad tracks that run along the west side of the site and also the Harbor Drive. The fact is that PAHs are pretty ubiquitous in our -- you know, in city environments. So that's a definite possibility for that. We're not able to pinpoint what they were from. But we don't believe that they're really a site-related release that we could find.

Now, for ground water, we did detect chlorinated solvents, particularly PCE, which is perchloroethene; TCE, which is trichloroethene; DCE, which is dichloroethene; and vinyl chloride. All of

those compounds are related-type compounds. They may even be the original solvent that was used or its breakdown product as it slowly breaks down into grades. The most significant thing is the highest VOC concentrations were the offsite wells that are up gradient from the site. I'll show you in a minute MW-14, which has the highest concentrations. It's gradient offsite.

We were also not able to identify any onsite source of VOCs either in soil or in ground water. So we -- again, we're concluding this from an offsite source. It's not a release at Site 4. And to close the loop and pursue this further, the Navy has contracted the Navy Public Works Center to investigate the source of those VOCs in ground water. And that is in the early portion of planning right now. And I think you'll be kept abreast of that as it progresses along.

Here is a map that shows the TCE in ground water at Site 4. Your handout may be a little easier to see. But, again, here is well MW-14. As you can see, it's offsite there. And the way it's contoured here, we have what appears to be the edge of a plume of ground water, TCE and ground water, and another one down about in here.

Now, this data is based on the RI sampling that

was done. We have done three additional ground water sampling rounds since the draft IR report. And the final report will have all that data incorporated into it. But now it looks like maybe there is some low detections of some of these VOCs in this well also. So this may not be two distinct plumes. It may actually be one plume. Navy PWC will be trying to determine just what the source is and maybe how far -- what the plume boundaries may be. I'll point out here that the ground water flow direction is generally from east to west as it's shown on here.

Okay. Our risk assessment results. Again, they don't show that the -- we have unacceptable risks for this current land use. That's the good news for Site 4.

And you can see here is a time line of what has occurred since we produced the draft report back in July. The period from August through December, we have received the comments from DTSC and the water board. And in December 2003, once we had all those comments, we prepared responses for them and sat down with the Agency partners to go over those -- the Navy's responses to them. We did that at a draft level just to sort of -- really I think it was at DTSC's request. Before they finalized their comments, they wanted to get a little

more information from us and see where our lines of thinking were. They finalized their comments and did those officially in February. Actually, shortly thereafter. And then if February, we issued our formal responses to those comments. In March, we got back additional comments on our responses. So we have responses to comments, and then responses again. So it's sort of the trail here. So from all of that, you may be able to discern that the agencies didn't agree with us a hundred percent on our responses.

In May 2004, we sat down with them again to go over what -- actually, we went over all the comments and focused in on those that were of greatest concern to DTSC. Many of those comments we were able to resolve quickly. They were not that significant. But we have several that are outstanding and they are significant and they do have bearing upon being able to proceed to a final RI report.

The first one that's shown there is DTSC, which has a concern with the PAHs that we detected in the fill material in the soil. They feel that those have a potential to leach into ground water and be a problem at some future time. Our reply to that was basically we haven't seen that in the period of time that the site has been in operation. And none of our wells are seeing

that. But they still feel there's that potential for those to leach into ground water.

And the biggest issue that we disagree on is the interpretation of what the ground water flow conditions are at the site. We are interpreting or the Navy is interpreting ground water basically to consist of a shallow ground water flow condition and a deeper ground water flow condition. DTSC doesn't necessarily agree with that, nor does the water board. The water board also is basically aligned with DTSC on this. They feel that it's all one big water -- water body. It's now in communication.

PETER BISHOP: Are we both looking at the same set of data?

TIM HEIRONIMUS: Yes, we are. Yes, we are. There's, I think, a conclusion here in a minute. But just to jump ahead to that. I think DTSC and the Water Board would prefer more information, more sampling, more study.

PETER BISHOP: Would that resolve the disagreement?

TIM HEIRONIMUS: Possibly.

CRAIG WOEMPNER: Are different contractors doing the testing or the same contractors?

TIM HEIRONIMUS: Actually, Navy Clean has does the remedial investigation. And the subsequent ground water

19:12:07 1 sampling that was done for these monitoring wells was
19:12:10 2 actually done by CDM. But we're working together with
19:12:16 3 them and taking their data and incorporating it. So
19:12:20 4 it's sort of a team effort.
19:12:25 5 This issue here is it has bearing upon whether
19:12:30 6 there's a need to do an ecological screening risk
19:12:35 7 assessment. In other words, does that ground water flow
19:12:40 8 into Paleta Creek, which is adjacent to Site 4? If it
19:12:45 9 does, then we would need to do an ecological risk
19:12:49 10 screening assessment. If our interpretation stands and
19:12:53 11 it is found that that ground water is not in direct
19:12:57 12 communication with the creek, then there would be a real
19:13:00 13 question of whether that would be something we would
19:13:06 14 want to do or need to do.
19:13:17 15 PETER BISHOP: Is this something that you can take
19:13:17 16 to higher authority or do have you to arm wrestle about
19:13:17 17 that?
19:13:17 18 TIM HEIRONIMUS: Those are some issues that we're
19:13:19 19 thinking about.
19:13:21 20 GENE MULLALY: Is that something that you would use
19:13:25 21 TPA for?
19:13:27 22 TIM HEIRONIMUS: I think you would find that pretty
19:13:29 23 interesting.
19:13:32 24 Just to kind of summarize, you can see where
19:13:35 25 the loggerhead is on a couple key issues. Our next

step, we're not going to give up. We're going to continue the discussions with the agencies and see how we can best resolve these issues. If they are -- if we do come to some agreement that there is a compelling need for additional data, then I think the Navy will make that decision at that time. But right now, I think your idea is not a bad one. An independent view with a fresh set of eyes might be helpful for everyone. And, you know, maybe they'll have some good recommendations for further work if necessary or a different way to look at it.

Anyway, we have our final goal here, to finalize this year. So we have a lot of work to do. And we're going to keep at it.

PETER BISHOP: You know, I think on something like this, you've got -- you're working on the same set of data and you have two different interpretations on it. Then you don't want this to become an open-ended sort of, you know, sample until the cows come home sort of thing. You can look at the data and say, okay, what's going to resolve this one way or the other? There's got to be a limited data set of additional information or data points that should answer the question. You know, we're all good hydrogeologists here and we can come to a --

19:15:08 1 CRAIG WOEMPNER: A resolution.
19:15:10 2 PETER BISHOP: -- a common approach. And so that
19:15:13 3 could be one way of going about this.
19:15:18 4 TIM HEIRONIMUS: I think it's a good way.
19:15:21 5 PETER BISHOP: I think the agencies should get
19:15:22 6 together on this and come to a meeting of minds. I
19:15:25 7 think from the community view point and having watched
19:15:29 8 this for many years, we would really like to see this
19:15:33 9 wrapped up.
19:15:34 10 TIM HEIRONIMUS: We were pretty optimistic back in
19:15:37 11 our December meeting. It looked like we made progress.
19:15:41 12 They both agreed with us that these VOCs were not from
19:15:45 13 this site. And they also were in basic agreement the
19:15:49 14 soil was not presenting an unacceptable risk. That left
19:15:55 15 the avenue for being able to close this site out through
19:15:59 16 a no further action record of decision with the
19:16:04 17 acknowledgement that the offsite VOC ground water source
19:16:09 18 was going to be carried through with a separate
19:16:11 19 investigation. So that -- that's the good news of all
19:16:15 20 of this.
19:16:17 21 The other -- the bad news I guess is what we
19:16:20 22 just went over. So we're still optimistic. I think we
19:16:26 23 can work through it. Maybe it's a good idea to have an
19:16:30 24 independent review of this and render some opinions on
19:16:34 25 it.

19:16:35 1 GENE MULLALY: Craig walked in when they
19:16:37 2 announced -- when they introduced the TPA folks. Are
19:16:42 3 you aware what it's all about?
19:16:44 4 CRAIG WOEMPNER: No. Sorry I was late. I can talk
19:16:48 5 to you later. I don't want to interrupt your meeting.
19:16:57 6 TIM HEIRONIMUS: Any other questions?
19:16:59 7 PETER BISHOP: We're done.
19:17:01 8 TIM HEIRONIMUS: Okay.
19:17:01 9 PETER BISHOP: Excellent. I don't see Darren.
19:17:04 10 THERESA MORLEY: I'm Darren. Tonight anyways. Just
19:17:08 11 real quickly. Going back to the record of decision for
19:17:11 12 Sites, 5, 7, 11 and 12. That had finally cleared the
19:17:17 13 lawyers and the technical people at southwest division.
19:17:21 14 It's funny. It has the lawyers and technical people.
19:17:24 15 Can't you guys agree. So we finally got through this.
19:17:27 16 And now DTSC had asked for a formal copy before it was
19:17:33 17 released for review, and we did give that to them. So
19:17:37 18 they're reviewing it. And we don't expect -- we haven't
19:17:40 19 heard any -- if we don't get any comments soon, we're
19:17:44 20 going to release it officially for review in mid to late
19:17:49 21 June. And then hopefully go from there. So you should
19:17:52 22 be seeing that next month.
19:17:54 23 And that is it. Do you guys have any other
19:17:57 24 general questions? Do you have any agenda items for
19:18:10 25 next time? Anything that you want to hear about?

19:18:14 1 Hopefully site 13 will be done. Right now, they're just
19:18:17 2 doing a risk assessment. It was kind of funny how
19:18:20 3 they -- there's just a little bit because the
19:18:23 4 contamination was very, very surface. That was next to
19:18:26 5 the sandblast grade. But when we took that, the risk
19:18:30 6 jumped up because all that was arsenic, which is
19:18:36 7 occurring. So it's going to have to be explained that
19:18:46 8 because that one should close as an unrestricted
19:18:46 9 residential. There isn't that much with that.
19:18:47 10 With that, you're free to go.
19:18:50 11 CRAIG WOEMPNER: Could we have a summary of how the
19:18:55 12 finances --
19:18:56 13 THERESA MORLEY: Next time?
19:18:57 14 CRAIG WOEMPNER: A breakdown.
19:18:59 15 THERESA MORLEY: What has been awarded?
19:19:01 16 CRAIG WOEMPNER: Yeah.
19:19:02 17 THERESA MORLEY: If the next one is September, we
19:19:04 18 can probably tell you what is planned for --
19:19:05 19 September 30th is the end of our fiscal year. We just
19:19:10 20 got a -- there's a COW. COW 1 and 2. COW 1, they took
19:19:20 21 money from everyone. And COW 2, the region, I don't
19:19:23 22 know how much it hit you guys. We're going to have to
19:19:26 23 layoff civilians if you keep taking money. We don't
19:19:31 24 have any more to give. I hope this ends because -- I
19:19:35 25 just hope it ends. But it may have a huge impact

financially. I don't know. It just seems like the Navy or maybe the other services is like this too. They ask for more money, and it ends up costing more. So it's not easy to deal with it. So it will be the last Wednesday in September.

CRAIG WOEMPNER: That's the end of your fiscal year?

THERESA MORLEY: Yes.

CRAIG WOEMPNER: That's odd. Ours is June July.

THERESA MORLEY: So is the State's.

Oh, and I gave you guys Tan Phung's card and Bill's card too. So I don't know if you guys want to get together by yourself. Gene, you kind of spearheaded the RAB grant. I don't know if you want to make a subcommittee or --

GENE MULLALY: Do you have time after the meeting?

PETER BISHOP: Sure.

THERESA MORLEY: With that, I'll adjourn the meeting. Thank you.

(Meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I, Brooke Silvas, Certified Shorthand Reporter, Certificate No. 10988, for the State of California, hereby certify:

I am the person that stenographically recorded the Restoration Advisory Board Meeting held on May 26, 2004.

The foregoing transcript is a true record of said meeting.

Dated JUL 20 2004.

Brooke Silvas

Brooke Silvas, CSR